## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

FRANCIS R. LOMBARDO, : CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:06-CV-1934

•

**Plaintiff** : (Judge Conner)

.

**v.** 

:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA BOARD OF

PROBATION & PAROLE, et al.,

:

**Defendants** 

## **ORDER**

AND NOW, this 25th day of October, 2006, upon consideration of plaintiff's motion (Doc. 9) for appointment of counsel, and it appearing that the resolution of plaintiff's claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 neither implicates complex legal or factual issues nor requires significant factual investigation or the testimony of expert witnesses, see Tabron v. Grace, 6 F.3d 147, 155-57 (3d Cir. 1993) (listing factors relevant to a request for counsel), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 9) is DENIED. If further proceedings demonstrate the need for counsel, the matter may be reconsidered either *sua sponte* or upon motion of plaintiff. See id. at 156.

S/ Christopher C. Conner CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The court assumes, for the purpose of ruling on the motion, that plaintiff's claim has an arguable basis in law and fact.

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  <u>See also Tabron,</u> 6 F.3d at 153 ("[Indigent civil] litigants have no statutory right to appointed counsel.").